



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,702	07/31/2003	Chen Kung Cheng	BHT-3098-158	1584

7590 11/30/2005

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
SUITE 1404
5205 LEESBURG PIKE
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22041

EXAMINER

GROSSO, HARRY A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3727

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/630,702

Applicant(s)

CHENG, CHEN KUNG

Examiner

Harry A. Grosso

Art Unit

3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the second partitioning slat (claims 4-11 and 13) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 and 12, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camp et al (2,713,962) (Camp) in view of Sunka (6,493,917).

4. Regarding claim 1, Camp discloses a pair of first assembling bodies (7, Figure 2) that are slat bodies with a vertical first insertion slit (32, Figure 9), a pair of second assembling bodies (6) positioned between the two ends of the first assembling bodies to form a rectangular frame and a first partitioning slat (29). The partitioning slat has a first fitting section (35) that is a polygonal block extending from one end of the partition having a first projection (36) and the block is fitted through the first slit (Figures 2, 4 and 9, column 2, lines 63-72). Camp does not teach using the frame formed by the assembling bodies and partition in a receptacle, however, Sunka discloses a receptacle with a frame and partitions used in a receptacle to divide the receptacle into compartments for organizing items (Figures 1 and 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the use of a frame formed by assembling bodies and partitions as disclosed by Camp with the receptacle of Sunka to provide a receptacle divided into compartments for organizing items.

5. Regarding claim 2, Camp discloses the upper and lower sides of the first fitting section abut the first assembling body (Figure 4).

6. Regarding claims 3 and 12, Camp discloses the distance between the upper end of the first projection and the bottom of the receptacle would be larger than the distance

between the upper end of the first insertion slit and the bottom of the receptacle as seen in Figure 4 since the bottom of the assembly shown in Figure 4 would sit on the bottom of the receptacle.

7. Claims 4-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camp and Sunka in view of Garcia (5,096,056).

8. Regarding claims 4, 5 and 13, Camp and Sunka disclose the invention with a second insertion slit in the second assembling body (6, Figure 2) and the second partitioning slat (28) with a polygonal fitting section being fitted through the second insertion slit, however, they do not teach the use of a second projection on the fitting section. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the use of a projection as used on the first fitting section with the second fitting section to provide a means for locking the second partitioning slat into the second assembling body.

9. Camp discloses the first and second partitions are notched to permit them to be interfitted but does not describe the notch. Garcia discloses first and second partitions with splits in the partitions to permit them to be interfitted (82, 86, Figure 3, column 3, lines 16-22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the use of first and second partitions with splits in the partitions as disclosed by Garcia in the partitions disclosed by Camp to permit them to be interfitted.

10. Regarding claims 6 and 7, Camp discloses the upper and lower sides of the second fitting section, as modified, abut the second assembling body (Figures 2 and 4).

11. Regarding claims 8-11, Camp discloses the distance between the upper end of the projection on the second fitting section, as modified, and the bottom of the receptacle would be larger than the distance between the upper end of the second insertion slit and the bottom of the receptacle as seen in Figures 2 and 4 since the bottom of the assembly shown in Figures 2 and 4 would sit on the bottom of the receptacle.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harry A. Grosso whose telephone number is 571-272-4539. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7am to 4 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Newhouse can be reached on 571-272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3727

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JES F. PASCUA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

for Nathan Newhouse
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3727

hag